

RESPONSE

In the Office Action of November 18, 2004, the Examiner has rejected pending Claims 1-21 as being unpatentable over Ko et al. in view of Rothermal et al. The Examiner has rejected pending Claims 22-25 as being unpatentable over Ko et al. in view of Rothermal et al. and Teng. The Examiner has rejected pending Claims 26-28 as being unpatentable over Ko et al. in view of Rothermal et al., Teng, and Cromer et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claims 16-28.

Claims 1 through 15 have been canceled, and certain amendments have been made to the claims to correct minor stylistic errors, as will be obvious to the Examiner.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to clarify Applicant's intended invention as "tracking changes to the contents of system files." This limitation is supported throughout the specification, including at page 5, lines 18-19.

Applicant respectfully asserts the argument that the Examiner's reliance on Ko et al. and Rothermel in support of an obviousness rejection of independent claim 16 is unconvincing. Both references are very broad in their discussions of network security. They do not teach the detection and tracking of system changes, as is taught in the present Application, nor do they make any suggestions that would lead one skilled in the art to reach Applicant's claimed invention based on the contents of these references. As such, independent claim 16 is patentable, as are all claims depending therefrom.

New claims have been added to the application as follows:
Independent claim 29, which is supported in the specification at page 30, para. 0065.

Independent claim 30 and dependent claims 31 and 32, which are supported in the specification at page 31, para. 0067.

Independent claim 33, which is supported in the specification at page 40, para. 0095.


Independent claim 34, which is supported in the specification at page 20, para. 0048.

Independent claim 35 and dependent claim 36, which are supported in the specification at page 40, para. 0094.

Independent claim 37, which is supported in the specification at page 41, para. 0097.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the section 103 rejection and allow claims 16-28 as currently presented, and Examine new claims 29-37. Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
William N. Hulsey III
Reg. No. 33,402

Dated: February 19, 2005

William N. Hulsey III
Hulsey^{IP} Intellectual Property Attorneys, P.C.
1250 S. Capital of Texas Hwy.
Building Three, Suite 610
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 795-1295 [Telephone]
(512) 233-2602 [Fax]